



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Ἐλπίοι το Ὁμια αἱ ἡάρουις, ἀγυρ ριόδcάν απ an οcταλῆν δεαῖτοις το na δάοιμις.

LUKE ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. III.—No. 25.

JANUARY, 1854.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.
Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Immaculate Conception—Dr. Cullen's Pastoral	1
Ancient Testimonies about the Apocrypha	1
The Forged Decretal Epistles—No. II.	2
The Heir of Ballymanus—No. I.	4
Talk of the Road—No. XX.	6
Free Discussion the best safeguard against Infidelity	7
CORRESPONDENCE—	
Was Pope Liberius a Heretic?—by a Roman Catholic—Postscript to Philalethes	9
On defects in the Mass—by A Catholic	10
Does the Church of Rome encourage the Holy Scriptures?	11
Dr. Cahill's attack on the Protestant Bible—by Enoch Hell	11
The Garden—Flowers for January	12
Farming Operations for January	13

THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION—DOCTOR CULLEN'S PASTORAL.

THE above long agitated question is not yet settled. But everything seems to indicate that it will be decided in the affirmative, and possibly soon.* Till then Roman Catholics are at liberty to discuss it.† But when once affirmed by the decree of the infallible judge, then, according to their doctrine, they can no longer deny, or even doubt it, without incurring the guilt of mortal sin. We sincerely believe that many pious and enlightened lay members of their communion intuitively shrink from the affirmative view.

We have already invited them to examine it in its full extent, and to declare their sentiments before it be too late—before their lips be closed for ever—before they be doomed, either to stifle the suggestions of conscience, or to be decried as heretics.

We again earnestly direct their attention to the same inquiry. And we now propose to set before them some of the inevitable consequences of an affirmative decision. For this purpose we shall quote the language lately used by two of their own prelates.

Dr. Cullen, in his late pastoral, ordering "*A Novena*," in preparation for the festival of the "*Immaculate Conception*," publishes the following as his view on the subject:—

"As we are about to solemnize that which, among the Festivals of the Virgin, is the first in order, and which presents her to us, in a special manner, as the *immaculate and spotless spouse of the Most High*, with whose *perfection sin is incompatible*, it becomes her clients to remove from their hearts every trace of guilt, every affection to sin." . . . "This tender mother, destined to co-operate in the great work of our redemption, will listen to the cry which her children send forth from this valley of tears. She is waiting to be intrusted with their petitions. Let us, then, fly to her with confidence, reminding her, with St. Bernard, that it has never yet been heard, that any one who had recourse to her protection, invoked her aid, implored her intercession, was left by her unpitied and forsaken. The refuge of sinners, and the comfort of the afflicted, will have compassion on her children, will plead powerfully for their pardon, and *infallibly* procure for them, if they be *faithful to her*, the *rich treasures of Divine grace*."

In the foregoing there is imputed to a mortal woman "*a perfection with which sin is incompatible*," a perfection befitting "*the immaculate and spotless spouse of the Most High*"—that is, nothing less than perfect holiness.

Perfect holiness cannot be ascribed to any created being. For "He putteth no trust in his saints, yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight." . . . "He putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly."‡

According to the Scriptures, perfect holiness belongs only to the Sacred Trinity.

I. The Father is the "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty."** He is "the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy."† "Holy and reverend is his name."‡ "There is none holy as God."§ "Thou only art holy."|| This is assigned as a reason why all should worship him. "Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at his holy hill, for the Lord our God is holy."¶ "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy (μόνος ὁ ἅγιος) for all nations shall come and worship before thee."***

II. The Son is styled "The Holy One and the Just,"†† and of him it is said—"He that is holy, He that is true."†††

III. Of the Spirit it is only necessary to remark, that his especial title is "The Holy Ghost."

Hence, it is manifest, that to represent the Virgin Mary as possessed of "*sinless perfection*," as "*immaculate and spotless*," is to raise her to a level with the Trinity, and to entitle her to share their worship and glory.

Thus, in the passages quoted above, she is represented as "*co-operating in the great work of our redemption*;" as "*listening to the cry which her children send forth from this valley of tears*," and waiting to be intrusted with their petitions.

Nor is this propounded as a mere theory. Its practical consequences are enforced. We "are to fly to her, since it has never yet been heard that any one who had recourse to her protection was left by her unpitied and forsaken." She, "the refuge of sinners and the comfort of the afflicted, will have compassion on her children, will plead powerfully for their pardon, and *infallibly* procure for them, if they be *faithful to her*, the *rich treasures of Divine grace*."

And as the Apostle forewarns those who draw nigh unto God that, "it is written, be ye holy, for I am holy," so Dr. Cullen tells the "clients" of the *immaculate and spotless spouse of the Most High*, that in solemnizing her festival it becomes them "to remove from their hearts every trace of guilt, every affection to sin."

Lastly, Dr. Cullen tells us, that she "*infallibly* procures" for those that are faithful to her "the *rich treasures of Divine grace*."

The Archbishop of Freiburg has lately taken up the cause of the Pope against his Sovereign, and thus embroiled himself and his hierarchy in political difficulties and sufferings. He calls on both clergy and laity to join in prayers for succour in his distress.

"Unite yourselves, then, to us in prayer—in an incessant prayer for the Church, which suffers among us—in prayer to Almighty God, to the Father, who directs the hearts of the mighty like rivers of water—in prayer to the Eternal Son, who acts victoriously as the invisible chief of his Church—in prayer to the Holy Ghost, who is given as the consoler to the Church unto the end of ages—in prayer to the Holy Virgin, the good mother of *Divine graces*, who rejects none of those who implore her intercession in this valley of tears."

Here the faithful are ordered to pray to the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Virgin; nor is the slightest difference suggested as to the manner of praying to the different persons of this new Quaternity. The objects of supplication are, indeed, different; as they might be also, when the different persons of the Trinity are separately addressed. But the mode of addressing them, or, in other words, the worship offered, is the same to all.

Lastly, the Archbishop, as well as Dr. Cullen, ascribes to the Virgin an important office of the Holy Ghost, when he styles her "the good mother of *Divine graces*."

Taking the announcements of both prelates as a sample of what is to be expected, when the doctrine of the "*Immaculate Conception*" shall be added to the creed of the Romish communion, the Virgin will be constituted the *spotless spouse* of the First Person of the Trinity, the *Immaculate Mother* of the Second, and the *Infallible Dispenser* of the *Graces* of the Third. What is this but to incorporate her with the Sacred Trinity—to identify her with Deity?!!! But can the decree of a poor mortal accomplish this? Or rather, must it not bring down vengeance

on those who, in this age of Scriptural knowledge, shall dare thus to tamper with the attributes of Deity?

Will enlightened Roman Catholics, then, remain passive, while priests and prelates are actively preparing the uneducated masses to acquiesce in the perpetration of this fatal crime? Will they wait till they must either break communion with their Church, or share in her guilt and condemnation? Would it not be wiser to save both themselves and her, or, at least, to endeavour to do so, by raising a manly and Christian protest against the affirmation of this long disputed doctrine?

ANCIENT TESTIMONIES ABOUT THE APOCRYPHA.

WE promised in our number, for November 1852, p. 126, column 2, to produce the evidence which all ages of the Church have left us, as to whether the six Apocryphal Books are really Scripture inspired by God. It was our first intention to give, on the one side the evidence against those books being Scripture, and on the other side what is produced as the evidence in favour of them; but, on consideration, we have resolved not to do so: for this reason; the evidence produced to prove that those books are really given by inspiration of God is so trifling, so utterly weak, that if we were to put it alongside of the evidence against those books, our readers might be tempted to think that we were not acting fairly; that we were purposely stating one side as strong as we could, and the other side as weak as we could. We, therefore, think it much better that the evidence in favour of those books should be stated by some Roman Catholic priest or layman, in our pages. Our readers will then be sure that each side is stated as strongly as it can be stated, and will be able to judge between them. We shall, therefore, give the evidence against those books being inspired, and we offer our pages to any Roman Catholic priest or layman, to state whatever evidence they can produce from the early ages of the Church in favour of the inspiration of those books.

I. The age of the Jews.
For this there is no witness equal to Josephus, himself a learned Jewish historian. And his testimony is this:—"We have only twenty-two books, containing the history of all time, which are deservedly believed in as divine: of these, five are the books of Moses, which contain both the laws and the account of the creation of man, up to his own death. . . . From the death of Moses to the time of Artaxerxes, who was king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets after Moses wrote the things done in their time, in thirteen books. The remaining four contain hymns to God, and precepts for the life of man. But from the time of Artaxerxes to our own time several have been written; but they were not worthy of like faith with those that went before, because there was not a certain succession of prophets. It is manifest, in fact, how we reverence our writings; for, such an age having already passed, neither any one has dared to add, nor to take away, nor to change. It is, as it were, implanted in all Jews from their birth to believe in these as the oracles of God. . . ." (quoted in Eusebius Eccl. Hist., Book III., ch. 10).

It is clear from this that the *twenty-two books ONLY* were the object of faith; that these only were esteemed by the Jews as the oracles of God; that the other books written after the time of Artaxerxes were not counted by the Jews as inspired.

These *twenty-two books* were the Old Testament, as it is in the Protestant Bible. The six apocryphal books in the Roman Catholic Bible were among those books written after the time of Artaxerxes. We need not dwell on this, as it is confessed on all sides. But we point attention to the real question, which is this—Those six books which were not counted inspired Scripture or the oracles of God by the Jews, up to the time of our Lord's coming—were those same books declared to be inspired Scripture by Christ and his Apostles?

II. The times of Christ and his Apostles.
We have some plain facts here.
1. Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever reproved the Jews for rejecting the apocryphal books out of their canon of Scripture; which they surely would have done, if those books had been given by divine inspiration.

* The Head of the Roman Catholic Church has already declared himself in favour of the doctrine. See the letter of Pius IX. to all the bishops in communion with the See of Rome, given at Cajeta, Feb. 2, 1849.—CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. I., p. 5.
† Ibid. See also page 20. ‡ Job xv. 15—iv. 18.

* Isaiah vi. 3—Revs. iv. 8. † Isaiah lvii. 15. ‡ Ps. cxl. 9. § 1 Sam. ii. 2. ¶ Revs. xv. 4. ¶ Ps. xclx. 9. ** Revs. xv. 4. †† Acts iii. 14. ††† Revs. iii. 7.

2. Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever quoted those books for Scripture, as they have done the other Scriptures of the Jews.

3. Christ himself, speaking to his Apostles, did expressly confirm and approve of the Jewish canon of Scripture, as the full and complete testimony of inspiration to himself. For after his resurrection he spoke thus to his Apostles—"These are the words which I spoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me."—Luke, ch. xxiv., v. 44, Douay Bible.

In these words it is evident that our Saviour referred to the Jewish Scriptures, as divided into the three parts mentioned by Josephus—1st, the Books of Moses; 2nd, the Prophets; 3rd, the Book of Psalms; which was the popular name among the Jews for the third division, though containing four books, because the Book of Psalms stood at the head of it, and so gave name to the four that were joined in that part.

It is confessed, on all sides, that the six apocryphal books were not among the Scriptures which our Lord thus spoke of.

The words of our Lord in that place are thus expounded by St. Augustine himself; when speaking of the Book of Maccabees, he says—"This writing, which is called Maccabees, the Jews do not hold, as they hold the Law, and the Prophets and the Psalms, to which the Lord gives testimony as being his witnesses."—August. lib. 2 contra Gaud. c. 23. And, again—"They demonstrate their Church in the precepts of the law, in the predictions of the Prophets, in the songs of the Psalms, that is, in all the canonical authorities of the sacred books."—August. de unitate ecel. c. 16.

So we have the testimony of our Saviour himself to the completeness of the Jewish canon of Scripture, and, therefore, of the Protestant Bible.

III.—The times of the Fathers.

Century II.—St. John, the last of the Apostles, died about the year 96. He is said by some to have left a complete canon of Scripture to the Church before he died, but that list is not recorded by those who have said so.

The first information we have on the subject is from Melito, Bishop of Sardis, about the year 160. Sardis was one of those seven Churches over which St. John presided, and to which he wrote the Epistles given in the second and third chapters of Apocalypse, or Revelation.

Eusebius, in his history, has inserted a letter from this Melito to one Onesimus, which is as follows—"Since you have desired accurately to know the books of the Old Testament, how many, and in what order they were written, I have laboured with all diligence to fulfil that

therefore when I was in the East, and came to the place itself in which those things were formerly preached and done, I learned diligently the books of the Old Testament, and I send you a list of them subjoined beneath: these are the names—five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua, son of Nun; Judges; Ruth; four books of Kings; two of Paralipomena; the Psalms of David; the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom; Ecclesiastes: the Song of Songs; Job; the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah; the twelve prophets in one Book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra."—Eusebius Eccl. Hist., lib. iv., c. 26. In this last Book of Ezra, the Fathers commonly included the Book of Nehemiah, as the two are on the same subject; as Lamentations was added to Jeremiah. So here, in the earliest list left us by the Fathers, we have precisely the list of the Protestant Bible now; and we find in it none of the six apocryphal books which the Church of Rome has added to the Bible.

Justin Martyr wrote about the same time, or a little later—viz., about the year 164. He has left us no list of Canonical Books; but we have something from him, inasmuch as he never quotes any of the apocryphal books, nor makes any mention of them; and while accusing the Jews, against whom he wrote, of many other things, and even of altering or leaving out some verses of Scripture, he never accuses them of rejecting any whole books of Scripture.

Century III.

Origen held some errors which we do not follow; but, of the early Christians he was the most learned in the Scriptures; and he is a good witness as to the fact what books were counted Scripture in his day; for of all the charges brought against him, none was of mutilating the Bible. He says—"It should be known that the books of the Old Testament are twenty-two, as the Hebrews (the Jews) have delivered;" and then follows the exact list of books in the Protestant Bible. He makes no mention of Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, or Wisdom; but he says—"the Maccabees are outside of these."—Quoted in Eusebius, book vi. ch. 25. Melchior Canus, a learned Roman Catholic bishop, confesses—"Origen, with the Hebrews, rejects these six books from the canon—Loc. com. lib. 2, c. 10 & 11.

Julius Africanus lived about the same time. We have nothing written by him except a letter to Origen,† all his other works having been lost. In that letter he undertakes to prove that the story of Susannah is a fable. In that

we think he went too far; but it is clear proof that he did not consider it to be the inspired Word of God. But this story (besides the six books) is now in the Roman Catholic Bible, being added to the Book of Daniel.

Tertullian lived about the beginning of this century. He says, alluding to Apocalypse or Revelations, c. iv, v. 8, "The number of the wings signifies that the ancient books were those well-known four-and-twenty." (Cont. Marcion, book 4, c. 7). Where we should note that St. Jerome has explained that those Fathers who counted twenty-four books, have not really made the Scripture greater, but only counted Ruth and Lamentations as separate books, instead of joining them on to Judges and Jeremiah—(Jerome in Prologo Galeato).

These are the testimonies that we have found on this subject in the first three centuries of the Church. In all those centuries we find no trace of any Christian having ever dreamed of reckoning the six Apocryphal Books, now in the Roman Catholic Bibles, a part of God's inspired Word to man. If any proof in favour of those books can be found in those three centuries, we call on all Roman Catholic priests and laymen, who may know of it, to produce it in our pages. If none such should be produced, it will be clear to our readers that no such proof exists.

Now, we ask our readers to consider, is it likely that our Lord and his Apostles should have left the Church in such gross ignorance, that no bishop, priest, or layman in it, for 300 years, should seem to have had any notion of a complete list of the books of Scripture; but that all who have left us lists should have given us incomplete and imperfect lists?

And, if there was no perfect Bible in those 300 years, how did the Church of Rome come by it in later times?

We will continue this evidence, century by century, until, we trust, our readers will be satisfied on the subject.

DECRETAL EPISTLES.

No. II.

SHOWING HOW THEY CAME TO BE BELIEVED, AND HOW THEY WERE USED.

WE proceed now to show how it was brought to pass that the Church was imposed upon by the forged epistles, pretended to have been written by the early Popes; and to what extent the Church was really imposed on by them.

We must first say a little more of the extent to which this system of forgery was carried. In our last number, we gave the list of forged and genuine Epistles, down to the year 400.* We cannot continue the list further in the same form, because the documents, both genuine and forged, get too numerous to be so dealt with in our pages. Those who examine the Bibliotheca Floriacensis, and other such collections, may have some idea of the vast extent of this system of forgery. Almost every collection that we examine brings to light new instances, and leads to the conclusion that almost every abbey and monastery adopted the system, and forged for itself whatever charters, or privileges, or confirmations it desired to possess. Along with this was a system, perhaps not less extensive, of altering and "cooking" genuine documents, to make them support whatever the forgers wished; but of this we shall treat separately hereafter.

With respect to these forgeries, it is impossible to deal with all of them together. We take for our present subject the collection published in the 9th century, under the name of "Isidore Mercator," noticing others only when produced by Popes of the 9th century.

This collection contained nearly all the forged Epistles which are given in the list in our last number. It contains, also, some forged Epistles of Popes who lived after the year 400, up to the time of Pope Gregory the Great, about the year 700; and also many councils, mostly genuine, but some doubtful, or forged.

Accounts vary a little about the publication of this collection. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, in the middle of the 9th century, states that they were first published by Riculphus, Bishop of Metz, who got them out of Spain, in the beginning of that century. Benedict, a Deacon of the Church of Metz, appears to have published them about the year 836, by order of Autgarus, who succeeded Riculphus as bishop. The name of "Isidore" seems to have been given to the collection in hopes that it might pass for the work of Isidore, a famous Bishop of Seville, in Spain, in the 7th century; but it is now confessed by all that the collection is none of his.†

* We fell into an error in that table in setting down no Epistles to Pope Sylvester, who stands No. 34 in the list. We were led into this error by Labbe and Cossart not having placed this Pope's Epistle under his name, as he does with all the others. But there is among the records of the Council of Nice, as given by them, a letter from that council asking the Pope to confirm their proceedings, and a letter from Pope Sylvester agreeing to do so.—Labbe and Cossart, vol. ii., p. 58. There is also a Roman Council under Sylvester (IIrd), in which he confirms what was done at Nice (page 410). These three documents are all forgeries. The forgers evidently felt that it was a fatal defect in their system, that the Pope should neither have called, nor presided in, nor confirmed, the first and greatest of the General Councils; and they thus tried to supply that defect.

† That the letters are forged, see Labbe and Cossart, marginal note. That the Council is a forgery, see the learned Benedictine monk, Constant, "Epistolæ Rom. Pontif." appendix, p. 55.

Constant also pronounces the letters forged, page 51; and he gives another forged letter of Sylvester (page 37) from the Bibliotheca Floriacensis.

† For this account see Du Pin, Eccl. Writers, vol. I., p. 583. Ed. Dublin, 1723. See also Labbe and Cossart, vol. I., p. 79 and 80.

Now for the use that was made of this collection, and the countenance that was given to it.

On this subject we find two opposite statements by Roman Catholic writers.

1st. That of Devoti, Archbishop of Carthage, and secretary to Pope Pius VII., who complains, "There is no one who does not know what triumphs the heretics make about these Decretals, and what a crop and material is thence taken for crafty and malicious calumny against the Apostolic See, as if she herself (Rome) had some part in the fraud of Isidore, and studied to overthrow the ancient discipline, and enlarge her own authority by his inventions."* He then states that all Catholic writers, except a few, had, of their own accord, and willingly, confessed that all that rested on the authority of Isidore alone were forged, and he goes on to say, that these Catholic writers also "show that no authority was interposed, no zeal shown, no care nor solicitude by the Roman Pontiffs, in publishing them; but that the whole thing was done, they being ignorant of it, and not thinking about it."†

The other account we take from the learned Jesuits, Labbe and Cossart, who made the famous collection of the councils; which statement they profess to adopt from the work "De Concordia Sacerdotii et Imperii," written by Peter De Marca, the Archbishop of Paris, whom they justly pronounce "the most learned of all the students of the Papal law;" and this account is as follows:—

"To the ancient law, confirmed by the consent of the universal Church, there succeeded a new law, which began to be published from the year 836: and Nicolas I. and the other Roman pontiffs, earnestly exerting themselves, by degrees it prevailed by use through the provinces of the west. That law is comprehended in the collection of Isidore."‡

Here it will be seen that an Archbishop of Paris, and two distinguished Jesuits, have made that very statement, which Devoti is angry with "the heretics" for making; they expressly affirm what Devoti denies, that the Popes did make use of the forgeries, and that it amounted to thrusting out the ancient law of the Church, and introducing a new one.

It may surprise some that the Jesuits, who have ever been the greatest supporters of Rome, should have made such an avowal; it does not surprise us. The Jesuits are wise master-builders: when the house is built, they take down the scaffolding, lest it should rot, and grow unsightly, and perhaps even involve the house itself in its own decay. In the same page to which we have referred, the Jesuits express their astonishment that Archbishop Binius, of Cologne, and Turrianus (another Jesuit), and other most learned men, "could have approved of those Decretal Epistles, in such a light of ecclesiastical learning." They do not express any wonder that those very learned men should have approved of what they must have known to be forgeries; but, that they should have done it when the world could see through it, was to them astonishing. In such a light of knowledge, Jesuitical wisdom itself suggested the candid avowal of the forgery.

Had those, who thus fully avowed the forgery, gone on to renounce all doctrines and practices which were established by those forgeries, and which had no other foundation, we should have no more to wish for, and these papers would never have been written; but, while the house stands, we must show with what scaffolding it was built, and on what foundation it rests. We shall have to show hereafter how many of the things, about which Roman Catholics and Protestants are now disputing, have their origin and foundation in the forged epistles. But our present business is with the question, which statement is the true one, that of Devoti, or that of Labbe and Cossart.

When Roman Catholics see what opposite statements are made by their own greatest writers, some saying that the Popes and the Church of Rome had nothing to do with establishing these forgeries; others saying expressly that it was the Popes themselves that accomplished it by their own efforts; and when they see even archbishops of their own Church ranged on opposite sides of this question, which so deeply affects the very foundation of the Roman system, and the laws of the Roman Church, they must needs be anxious to know which is right: is the Roman system really founded on the Word of God that cannot lie? or was it introduced in ages of ignorance by the help of forgeries, only worthy of the father of lies?

This seems to us to be the real import of the question, which of those statements is true.

We have no hesitation in saying that the statement of

* Nemo ignorat, quot de his decretalibus hæretici triumphos agant, quanta exinde seges, ac materia sumatur calidæ et malitiosæ calumnie contra Sedem Apostolicam, quasi ipsa in fraude Isidori partes aliquas habuerit, ejusque inventis antiquam disciplinam evertere, suamque auctoritatem amplificare studuerit.—Jus Canonium, præface, p. iv. and v., first published at Rome, 1864, and republished at Rome, 1867. We quote from the latter.

† Nullam a Romanis Pontificibus in his evulgandis interpositam fuisse auctoritatem, nullum adhibuit studium, nullam curam, et sollicitudinem, immo rem totam gestam fuisse, his ignavis nec opinantibus. . . . p. v.

‡ Antiquo juri universalis ecclesiæ assensu roborato, successit jus novum, quod ab anno 836, publicari cepit: et adnitate Nicolao I. et cæteris Romanis pontificibus paulatim usi invaluit per occidentis provincias, us illud comprehensum est collectione Isidori. . . . Labbe and Cossart, Con. Gen. vol. I. col. 78, ed. Paris, 1672. The italics are their own.

* Two of them are called the Books of Samuel in the Protestant Bible.

† Called Chronicles in the Protestant Bible.

‡ In the works of Origen, vol. II.